

COLLOCATION IN AMANUBAN-AMANATUN DIALECT OF UAB METO

Maria Regina Tampani ^{a,1*}
Soleman Dapa Taka ^{b,2}
Muhammad Arif ^{c,3}

^a Student of English Education Study Program, Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, Indonesia

^{b,c} Lecturer of English Education Study Program, Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, Indonesia

¹ mariatampani21@gmail.com,

² sdapataka@mail.com

³ muhammad_arif@staf.undana.ac.id

KEYWORDS

Collocation,
Amanuban-Amanatun,
Dialect,
Uab Meto

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to find out the collocation words and described the types of collocation used in *Amanuban-Amanatun* Dialect. The method of this research was descriptive method. For such a purpose, the writer chose five informants as the representatives of the native speakers of *Amanuban-Amanatun* who live in *Kesetnana* village. To obtain the data, the writer employed translation task and elicitation technique. The result of this research is that *Amanuban-Amanatun* Dialect has some collocation words and their types can be divided into some categories. They are: Noun + verb, (in nu' – au u'et) Verb + Noun, (tah mak ane-teuk pena) Noun + Noun, (bia keso – fafi mone) pronoun + Adjective (au uhin – in nahin). There are 33 collocation expressions gained from *Amanuban-Amanatun* Dialect of Uab Meto

How to cite: Tampani, M. R., Dapa Taka, S., Arif, M. (2026). COLLOCATION IN AMANUBAN-AMANATUN DIALECT OF UAB METO. *SPARKLE Journal of Language, Education and Culture*, 8 (1) 72 – 78.

INTRODUCTION

In every aspect of human life, especially in relationships between humans, language is the most effective means of communication between humans. Without language, a person cannot express his ideas, feelings, emotions and intentions to others. It is clear that language plays a very important role in human life. This reason is supported by the following view: "Through a language, men express their emotions, communicate their intentions, react to other people and situation, influence other human beings" (Rivers, 1970). In other words, It can be stated that language is a communication tool used by people to interact with each other. As a means of communication, language is basically spoken and formed from sounds and meanings. The language used will vary based on the event being discussed. This can be seen from the content of the event, and the background of the people involved in the event.

Indonesia has 38 provinces with very diverse cultures and languages. One of the languages is the Dawan language or (Uab Meto). The Dawan language consists of six dialects, namely (1) *Amfoang-Fatuleu-Amabi*, covering the areas like Amfoang, *Fatuleu*, *Amabi* especially in Kupang Regency, (2) *Amanuban-Amanatun*, covering the areas like *Amanuban*, *Amanatun*, (3) *Mollo-Miomafo* covering the areas like Mollo, Miomafo, especially in Central Timor Regency, (4) *Biboki-Insana*, covering the areas like *Biboki*, *Insana* especially in Central Timor Nourt, (5) *Ambenu* covering the areas like *Ambenu*, (6) *Kusa-Manela*, covering the areas like *Kusa*, *Manela* especially in the southern part of Central Timor Regency (Grimes 1997) In everyday life, people use a language called the *Amanuban-Amanatun* dialect of the *Uab Meto* language, but it is not exactly the same depending on the place or region.

Fromklin and Rodman (1995) stated that semantics is the study of the linguistic meaning of words, phrases and sentences. Semantics really becomes gist of using a language for without meaning, language will be meaningless. There are many kinds of meaning, such as conceptual

meaning, connotative meaning, affective meaning, stylistic meaning, reflective meaning, thematic meaning and finally the collocative meaning known as collocation.

A collocation is an exact combination of two or more words that often appear together. Collocations define a series of words or terms that occur together more often than would be expected by chance. Collocations sound common to native speakers but are usually confusing to non-native speakers. This means that knowing collocations is considered an important part in understanding the meaning of a language, including the *Uab Meto* language, especially the *Amanuban-Amanatun* dialect.

METHOD

The method used in this study was descriptive method. Nazir (1988) stated that descriptive method is a method used to investigate a group of people, an object, a set of condition, illustration of facts, as well as the characteristics among the phenomenon being investigated. The research subjects of this study were five people from *Amanuban-Amanatun* community in Soe, especially at Kesetnana village. They were taken as the informants for data collection. In choosing these informants, the writer used the criteria as suggested by Djajasudarma (1993), as follows:

- a. They are ready to become informants.
This criterion used is based on consideration that the writer avoids per forcing condition, for the informants can give true data if they really get ready and not forced to take part in the research
- b. They are physically and mentally healthy.
The consideration is that the informants are in a healthy condition both physically and mentally for genuine data.
- c. They use their native language in their daily communication.
This criterion is based on the consideration that the native speakers who always speak their native language usually use much more original words than those who have mixed it with foreign languages.
- d. The informants are adult (30-80 years old)
The native speakers for such ages have much more experiences and comprehension about their language than those who are not adult yet. In this case, the informants of this study were people aged 30 until 80 years old.

The instrument used to collect the data in this research was elicitation technique. The obtained data were analyzed using the techniques of Listing, sorting, interpreting and describing. Some collocation words listed in the *Uab Meto* used in everyday communication by people in *Kesetnana* were presented. After that the researcher sorted out the words obtained during the data collection process This included which words regarded important and which ones need to be discussed as appropriate collocation language followed by descriptions on types of Collocation in *Amanuban-Amanatun* Dialect of *Uab Meto* using the theory of McCarthy and O'Dell (2008).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

During the study, the researcher found out that there are collocation words in *Amanuban-Amanatun* Dialect. The collocation words in *Amanuban-Amanatun* are grouped based on the types of lexical collocation and there are no grammatical elements of collocation such as preposition, or particular structural pattern such as gerund found in this dialect. Lexical collocation in *Amanuban-Amanatun* dialect are divided into the following types of combinations:

- a. Verb + Noun
- b. Noun + Verb

- c. Noun + Noun
- d. Pronoun + Adjective

A total numbers of collocation words found during the research with their types are categorized and transcribed into the following table:

1. Verb + Noun

Table 1. Collocation in Amnuban-Amanatun Dialect of Uab Meto

Lexical Collocation in Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect	English Translation
<u>Hit tah mak ane</u> – <u>hit teuk noah</u> We eat rice – We eat coconut	We are eating the rice – We are eating the coconut
<u>Hit bet ika</u> – <u>hit tasek pena</u> We fry fish - We fry corn	We are frying the fish – We are frying the corn
<u>Hit tapau Pena</u> – <u>hit kon Laku</u> We pound corn – We pound cassava	We are mashing the corn - We are mashing the cassava
<u>Ho Boe haen</u> – <u>au fase blua</u> You wash foot – I wash clothes	You are washing the foot – I am washing the clothes
<u>Au tum lahi</u> – <u>hit fona tasu</u> I Rub dead skin cell – We rub frying pan	I am rubbing the dead skin cell – We are rubbing the frying pan
<u>Hit loit kan'muif</u> – <u>au ena kaet'nef</u> We money no – I mother no	We do not have any money – I do not have a mom
<u>Hit taheun oe</u> – <u>ho sote mnes</u> We draw water – You draw rice	We draw water – You draw rice
<u>Au is puah</u> – <u>hit saip tefu</u> I peel nut – We peel sugarcane	I am peeling the nut – We are peeling the sugarcane
<u>Hit sek pena</u> – <u>au iup niman</u> We break corn – I break hand	We are breaking the corn – I am breaking his/her hand
<u>Au ek eno</u> – <u>au tala nai</u> I closed door – I closed pot	I close the door – I close the pot
<u>Hit takmeu utan</u> – <u>hit taini mnes</u> We cleaning vegetables – We cleaning rice	We are cleaning the vegetables – We are cleaning the rice
<u>Hit lol fafi</u> – <u>au heo manu</u> We kill pig – I kill chicken	We kill the pig – I kill the chicken
<u>Hit ta'et kuan</u> – <u>ho mnu ume</u> We see village – You see house	We are seeing the town – You are seeing the house
<u>Au seu Noah</u> – <u>hit sek uki</u> I pick coconut – We pick banana	I am picking the coconut – You are picking the banana
<u>Au eu nakfunu</u> – <u>hit ketu knusaf</u> I cut hair – We cut nails	I am cutting his/her hairs – We are cutting his/her nails
<u>Hit naksua laku</u> – <u>hit hain afu</u> We dig cassava – We dig ground	We are digging the cassava – We are digging the ground
<u>Au bius asu</u> – <u>hit tuf atoni</u> I hit dog – We hit people	I am hitting the dog – We are hitting the people
<u>Au tun laku</u> – <u>ho mot pu'at</u> I burn cassava – You burn trash	I am urning the cassava – You are burning the trash

2. Noun + Verb

Table 2. Collocation in Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect of Uab Meto

Collocation in Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect of Uab Meto	Translate
--	-----------

In nu' – Au u'et She/he saw – I saw	She/He saw – I saw
Au uah – asu nah I eat – dog eats	I eat – Dog eats
Au iun – in niun I drink – You drink	I drink – She drinks
au uhan – sin nahan I cook – They cook	I cook – They cook
Au u'bae – sin na'bae I play – They play	I am playing – They are playing

3. Noun +Noun

Table 3. Collocation in Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect of Uab Meto

Collocation in Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect of Uab Meto	Translation
Hit uki Nokof – au mau nekaf We banana heart – my heart	Banana heart – My soulmate
Hit bia keso – hit fafi mone We cow male – We pig male	Bulls – Boar
Hit noe hape – hit oe ulan We water spittle – We water rain	Saliva – Rain water
Hit pena boto – hit ukase sufa We corn flower – We flower papaya	Popcorn – Flower of papaya

4. Pronoun+ Adjective

Table 4. Collocation in Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect of Uab Meto

Collocation in Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect of Uab Meto	Translation
Au umas – in namas I beautiful – She beautiful	I am beautiful – She is beautiful
Au uhin – in nahin I smart – She smart	I am smart – She is smart
Au umen – in namen I sick – She sick	I am sick – She is sick
Au umnah – in namnah I hungry – She hungry	I am hungry – She is hungry
sin namfau – hai mimfau They many – We many	Many of them – Many of us

Discussion

In this part, some interesting collocation patterns in the Amanuban-Amanatun dialect of Uab Meto are revealed. The data shows four distinct types of lexical collocations: Verb + Noun, Noun + Verb, Noun + Noun, and Pronoun + Adjective. These patterns provide valuable insights into the linguistic structure and semantic relationships in this dialect.

Firstly, the Verb + Noun collocation pattern appears to be the most productive in the Amanuban-Amanatun dialect, with numerous examples documented in the data. Examples such as "hit tah mak ane" (we eat rice) and "hit bius asu" (I am hitting the dog) demonstrate how specific verbs combine with particular nouns in predictable ways. This aligns with Nesselhauf's (2003) observation that verb-noun collocations are among the most common types across languages, although their specific restrictions vary by language. What is particularly interesting is the restrictive

nature of these collocations. For example, while "hit tah mak ane" (we eat rice) and "hit teuk noah" (we eat coconut) are acceptable, the study notes that "hit tah noah" and "hit teuk mak ane" are not permissible combinations. This demonstrates the arbitrary nature of collocational restrictions that McIntosh (1961) described as "collocational glue" - certain words simply "belong together" in ways that native speakers intuitively understand.

Secondly, the Noun + Verb collocations in this dialect show interesting subject-verb agreement patterns that appear to be morphologically marked. For example, "in nu" (she/he saw) versus "au u'et" (I saw) shows distinct verb forms depending on the subject pronoun. Aikhenvald and Dixon (2006) argue that such agreement patterns are crucial in languages with complex morphology, as they maintain referential coherence in discourse. However, Palmer (1981) presents a contrasting view, suggesting that collocation patterns like these might be better analyzed as grammatical constraints rather than lexical collocations per se. This raises questions about where to draw the line between grammatical rules and lexical co-occurrence restrictions in Uab Meto.

Thirdly, the Noun + Noun collocations reveal compound-like structures that create specialized meanings, such as "hit uki nokof" (banana heart) and "hit bia keso" (bulls, literally "cow male"). These patterns resemble what Benson et al. (1986) categorize as lexical collocations that form specialized semantic units. Jackendoff (2002) suggests that such compound-like structures often exhibit semantic unpredictability - the meaning of the whole isn't always transparently derived from its parts. This appears to be the case with "hit uki nokof" which translates as "banana heart" but can metaphorically refer to "my soulmate" according to the data.

Fourthly, the Pronoun + Adjective collocations exhibit morphological variation based on the pronoun used. For instance, "au umas" (I am beautiful) versus "in namas" (she is beautiful) demonstrates morphological fusion between the pronoun and adjective. According to Rubino's (2005) work on Austronesian languages, this pattern suggests a form of agreement marking that's highly morphologized. Pawley (2006), in his work on Pacific languages, argues that such patterns often emerge from historical grammaticalization processes where once separate words become fused into single morphological units. This might explain why "au namas" and "in umas" are not acceptable combinations - the morphological agreement is obligatory.

The results and findings from this study present both support and challenges to current theories of collocation. On one hand, they support Sinclair's (1991) idiom principle, which suggests that language users have access to a large number of semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices in the mental lexicon. The restrictive nature of collocations in Uab Meto (e.g., "hit tapau pena" but not "hit tapau laku") demonstrates these constraints clearly.

On the other hand, these results and findings challenge universalist approaches to collocation. Wray (2002) argues that collocation patterns are largely arbitrary and must be learned as part of language acquisition. However, the morphological patterns in the Pronoun + Adjective and Noun + Verb collocations in Uab Meto suggest that some collocational restrictions are systematically linked to grammatical categories, potentially making them more predictable than arbitrary.

Gil (2013), in his typological work on Austronesian and Papuan languages, suggests that the lines between lexical and grammatical collocations can be particularly blurred in languages of this region. The absence of grammatical collocations (noted by the researcher) but the presence of grammaticalized agreement patterns presents an interesting theoretical tension that deserves further investigation.

Comparing these findings with other Austronesian and Papuan languages reveals both similarities and differences. Bowden (2001), in his research on Eastern Indonesian languages, notes

that verb-noun collocations often show tight semantic restrictions similar to those found in Uab Meto. However, Klamer (2002) argues that the morphological fusion observed in pronoun-adjective constructions is relatively rare in the broader Austronesian family.

Donohue (2005) presents evidence that languages in contact zones between Austronesian and Papuan language families (which may include Uab Meto) often show hybrid collocation patterns that don't neatly fit into typological expectations for either family. This suggests that the collocation patterns documented here may reflect complex historical contact situations.

The study appears to have collected a substantial corpus of collocations, which is commendable. However, as Gries (2013) points out, collocation studies ideally require large corpora to identify statistical patterns of co-occurrence. The relatively small sample presented may limit the generalizability of the findings.

Furthermore, as Newman and Rice (2006) argue, collocation studies should ideally distinguish between high-frequency, statistically significant collocations and culturally or pragmatically determined ones. The present study doesn't appear to make this distinction, which could be addressed in future research.

The documentation of collocation patterns in Uab Meto contributes significantly to our understanding of this language. As Evans (2010) argues, capturing the idiomatic and collocational aspects of endangered languages is crucial for comprehensive documentation efforts, as these are often the first elements to be lost in language shift situations.

Additionally, as Himmelmann (1998) notes, collocation patterns can provide important insights into cultural conceptualizations encoded in language. The metaphoric extension of "hit uki nokof" (banana heart) to mean "my soulmate" presents just such a culturally specific meaning that merits further ethnolinguistic investigation.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of data analysis and discussion, the conclusions that can be withdrawn in relation to collocation words and collocation types found out in *Amanuban-Amanatun* Dialect of *Uab Meto* are as follows:

1. Generally, collocation in the Amanuban-Amanatun Uab Meto dialect occurs in the form of lexical categories, without involving grammatical elements. In the Uab Meto language, collocation refers to two words that are identical but have different meanings. For example, 'ek eno' collocates with 'tala nai', meaning that 'ek' and 'tala' both convey the meaning of 'close'. However, 'ek' cannot be combined with 'nai', and conversely, 'tala' cannot be paired with 'eno'. As a result, 'ek' can only be used in certain sentences, while 'tala' is limited to other specific sentences.
2. The writer discovered 33 collocation word combinations, which fell into several categories:
 - a. Noun + Verb (e.g., 'hit tah mak ane' collocates with 'hit teuk noah')
 - b. Verb + Noun (e.g., 'au uhan' collocates with 'sin nahan')
 - c. Noun + Noun (e.g., 'in Noe hape' collocates with 'hai oe ulan')
 - d. Pronoun + Adjective (e.g., 'Au umen' collocates with 'In namen').

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, A. Y., & Dixon, R. M. W. 2006. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Typology*. Oxford University Press.

- Benson, M. at all. 1986. *Lexicographic Description of English*: Jhon Benyamins Publication company.
- Bowden, J. 2001. *Taba: Description of a South Halmahera Language*. Pacific Linguistics.
- Djajasudarma, F.T. 1993. *Metode Linguistic (Ancangan metode Penelitian dan Kajian)* Bandung: PT Eresco
- Donohue, M. 2005. Syntactic and lexical factors conditioning the diffusion of sound change. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 44(2), 427-442.
- E. van Lier (Eds.), *Flexible Word Classes* (pp. 89-130). Oxford University Press.
- Fromklin, & Rodman, 1955. *An Introduction to Language* (5th edition). Forth worth, Hercourt Brace Jovanovich college publiShers.
- Gil, D. 2013. Riau Indonesian: A language without nouns and verbs. In J. Rijkhoff
- Gries, S. T. 2013. 50-something years of work on collocations: What is or should be next. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 18(1), 137-166.
- Grimes, E. at al. 1997. *A Guide To The People And Language of Nusa Tenggara*
- Himmelmann, N. P. 1998. Documentary and descriptive linguistics. *Linguistics*, 36(1), 161-195.
- Jackendoff, R. 2002. *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution*. Oxford University Press.
- Klamer, M. 2002. Typical features of Austronesian languages in Central/Eastern Indonesia. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 41(2), 363-383.
- McCarthy, & O'Dell. 2008 *English Collocation in Use*: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- McIntosh, A. 1961. Patterns and ranges. *Language*, 37(3), 325-337.
- Nesselhauf, N. 2003. The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), 223-242.
- Newman, J., & Rice, S. 2006. Transitivity schemas of English EAT and DRINK in the BNC. In S. T. Gries & A. Stefanowitsch (Eds.), *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 225-260). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Palmer, F. R. 1981. *Semantics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Pawley, A. 2006. Where have all the verbs gone? Remarks on the organisation of languages with closed verb classes. In F. K. Ameka, A. Dench, & N. Evans (Eds.), *Catching Language: The Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing* (pp. 135-163). Mouton de Gruyter. Pawley
- Rivers, 1970. Collocation In Amanuban-Amanatun Dialect, Kupang: UKAW Press, 162.
- Rubino, C. 2005. Austronesian languages. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 584-594). Elsevier.
- Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford University Press.
- Wray, A. 2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.